

United States Patent and Trademark Office

NITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE nited States Patent and Trademark Office

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,333		09/10/2003	Noriyuki Sasaki	122.1567	1877
21171	7590	09/28/2006		EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			. FATAHIYAR, MAHMOUD		
SUITE 700 1201 NEW		VENUE, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2629	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/658,333	SASAKI, NORIYUKI				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mike Fatahiyar	2629				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DISSIDER IN THE MAILING DEPOSIT OF THE M	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 J	ul <u>y 2006</u> .					
		s action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc		Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	∋ 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment	(le)						
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notic	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ite				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:	atent Application				

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1,5, 7, 10, 14 and 18 are, the recited recitation "during automatic operation" is vague and indefinite because it is not clear to what it refers. In other words, is unclear during automatic operation of what element the electric power condition is stored in a storage section. What constitute this automatic operation is unclear.

Correction and/or clarification is required.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-7, 10-14 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto(20030061526A1) in view of Yoshida(5,894,580).

Hashimoto discloses a method and an apparatus for power reduction management of an information processing device comprising a task management application program for relating times to power saving settings(see abstract and

Art Unit: 2629

paragraphs[0008]-[0014]) comprising an input/output control section(44) and a management table(152-154; see figure 1) which are function as claimed. Hashimoto substantially show all the features of the above claims except for the "during automatic operation" performing the power saving function. However, Yoshida is cited to show that the concept of utilizing an automatic turn-off timer for a display device for power saving purposes is old(see abstract; column 2, lines 48-55; column 5, lines 21-67; column 6 through column 7, lines 1-10 and column 8, lines 23-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hashimoto with the noted teaching of Yoshida such that to automatically turn off the backlight of an LCD display device regardless of any input or output signals being transferred because both systems are related to power saving for a display device.

4. Claims 8-9 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto and Yoshida as applied to claims 7 and 14 above, and further in view of Yasunobu(JP abstract 11126118A).

Hashimoto and Yoshida are discussed above. Yasunobu is cited to show that the concept of limiting brightness of the backlight of an LCD device by reducing output electric power of an inverter of the backlight for power saving purpose is old(see the abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the noted teachings of Yasunobu to the modified system of Hashimoto such that the power saving task management of Hashimoto would perform power saving of an LCD display device with a backlight by reducing output electric power of an inverter of the backlight

Art Unit: 2629

because all the applied references are related to power saving management of input/output devices.

5. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto and Yoshida as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Fujii et al(6,442,443B1).

Hashimoto and Yoshida are discussed above. Fujii et al is cited show that the concept of reducing output power of an speaker device during a predetermined time is old(see figure 2 and the abstract). Therefor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the noted teachings of Fujii et al to the modified system of Hashimoto such that to perform a power reduction of an speaker device as an output device because all the applied references are related to power management of input/output devices of a computer system.

- 6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tsuji et, Chen et al and Nishikawa are made of record to show various types of display devices having some sort of automatic power-off timer for power saving purposes.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Fatahiyar whose telephone number is (571)272-7688. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Application/Control Number: 10/658,333

Art Unit: 2629

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Fatahiyar

September 25, 2006

SUPPLIED TO THE PATENT EXAMINER Te

JENTER 2600

Page 6